~~CHIEF~~ SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

REVENUE BRANCH.

OFFICE NOTE.

SUBJECT. The separation of the village of Pasaimpura and Hangala hosalli from the respective villag of Kaligaundanahalli and Han gala in the Gundlupet Talu

LAST REFERENCE. Letter No. 219 dated 24. 9. 98

from The Survey Superintendent

—o—

1. The Survey Superintendent in his letter No 2 dy 1st April 1892 having recommended the absorption of certain villages in the Gundlupet Taluk into other villages of the same Taluk, the Govt ordered the absorptio recommended, in their Notn No 15 dy 11th April 1892. In accordance with

this order, the two villages of Pacaimpura and Kangaikosakadi were assorted in the respective villages of Kadigaundanadi and Kangaiku. The Kanakiyogo of these four villages being four different persons, the dissorption affected their interests and in November 1872, Kanakiyogo Nanjundaiya of Kangaikosakadi and Subbaya of Pacaimpura petitioned[x] the Deputy Commr, requesting that the villages, the Kanakiyogi kadi of which vested in them, might be treated as separate and not included in any others. Kanakiyogi Nanjundaiya stated that his village (Kangaikosakadi) had

a

[x] Serial Nos 1 & 2 of the records file.

a levy of Rs 26/- 4- 3, that the ryots were beginning to build houses here, and that there was a proclaiming of a great portion of waste land being brought under cultivation. Shanmuga Sundaya stated that his village (Pasupura) contained 40 houses with a population of 196 persons and that the Jamabandi thereof was 161 odd Rupees.

2. The Dy Comr then ~~ordered~~ ~~enquiry to be~~ enquired* as to how the Amildar recommended the absorption of the villages in question, if it resulted in the inconvenience represented by the Shanmuga Nanjundaiya and Subra

* Serial No 2 of res: file.
No 64 & 29. M. 22.

3. In the meanwhile, the Sivaniingo again petitioned[x] the Dy Comr in January 1893, repeating their request.

4. On the 26th February 1893, the Amildar reported[x] that on the absorption of Pasaipura in Kaligaudanahalli was not recommended, that the village was a Chirak one, that its absorption took away the tank of the Sivaniing and that it should be separated. Regarding Rangaiahasalli, he stated that the village had a levy of above Rs 200/-, that though Bachirak Several ryots intended to build houses there, that a great portion of waste land was about to be brought under culti-

[x] Nos 34 & 35 of ver: file.

[x] No 6 of ver: file.
No 785 & 26 & 93.

[x] But it will be seen later on that the Amildar did recommend the amalgamation in question.

-vation and that this village
also should be kept separate.
The Asst Comr in charge
of the Taluk forwarded
this report of the Amil-
dar to the Dy Comr for
orders and stated that
the Shanbhogs had a
real grievance and that
the separation of the villages
in question was desirable.
The Deputy Comr forwarded
the papers to the Survey
Superintendent for dis-
posal and stated that
both the Amildar and the
Assistant Comr in charge
of the Taluk were in favour
of the villages being
separated. On reply the
Survey Superintendent
stated that sanction of
Govt for the exception

of

[x] Serial No 6 of vernl file.
No 2041 dt 10. 8. 93.

[y] Serial No 6 of vernl file.
No 1866 dt 20. 5. 93.

[z] Serial No 67 of 91-92

of the villages in question
was obtained in accordance
with the recommendation
made by the District and
Taluk authorities, that it
was not convenient to
separate them again and
that the Shanbhags might
work ~~accordan~~ by turns
according to their kali
and the Potgi given to them
as they worked. This was
communicated to the x
Amildar and it was
ordered that if there was
no objection, the Shanbhogs
might work by turns.
On enquiry by the Amil- x
dar, the Shanbhogs of
Hanagala and Kaligau-
danahalli, villages to
which the other two were

x Serial No 7 of 1.9.
etc 1739 of 20. 6. 93.

x Serial Nos 8, 9, 10 of 1.9.

added, stated before him that they were not willing to work by turns and the Shanbhogs of the other two villages stated that they should either be allowed to work by turns or their villages be separated and given to them. The Amildar in reporting this stated that no justice could be done in the division of work between the Shanbhogs of Hangalakaralli and Hangala, the Jamabandi of which was Rs 1152-1-10 and that in every 8 years the work of Kaligandanahalli may be done for 7 years by the Shanbhog thereof and for one year by the Shanbhog of Kaginpura. The exact

× Serial No 2 of P.P. No 147 of 6.9.93.

× Jamabandi 214-14-0

× Jamabandi Rs 370-4-0

× Jamabandi Rs 161-13-3

Comm^{r} forwarded this × Serial No 1 of I. P.
report of the Amildar to No 565 of 19-9-93.
the Dy Comr with the
observation that confusion
of accounts would result
if the Shanbhags were
permitted to work by
turns and that it was
better to keep the villages
separate. The Dy Comr
then enquired × whether it × Serial No 2 of I.P.
was not possible to appoint No 21 of 16-10-93
one Shanbhag as an
assistant to the other or
to divide the Potgi between
them. The Amildar re- × Serial No 3 of I. P.
ported that the potgi No 425/160 of 20-2-94.
might be divided among
them in proportion to the
berij of each village,
the Shanbhags of the larger
villages being asked to

pay the proportionate potgi to the other Shanbhogs, but that the Shanbhogs of Hangalahosanâlli and Pasaingara prayed for the separation of their villages and that if the Shanbhogs be appointed to work by turns, it would be prejudicial to Govt work. The Dy Comr then asked the Asst Comr to give his opinion in the matter and the Asst Comr who was also the Jamabandi Officer, reported that the amalgamations in question were made after the Survey Settlement at the recommendation of the then Amildar, that the Shanbhogs concerned were

* Serial No 2 of D. P.
▲ No 522/163 of 17.10.94.

× Serial No 19 of D. P.
Vide also Nos 13 & 19.

were not consulted in the matter, that they were not willing to come to terms as to division of work or potgi, that if they were to work by turns, Govt. interests would suffer and that it was not proper to set Shanbhag over villages to which they had no hak. He recommended that it was better both in the interests of the Shanbhag and of Govt. to have the villages separated as before the Survey Settlement.

5. The Dy Commr then asked[x] the opinion of the Survey Superintendent on the subject, who replied[x] that he was not in favor of

[x] Serial No 2 of 1. 9. No 1666 of 1. 6. 95.

[x] Dº No 1873 of 25. 6. 95

Separating the villages, as there were inconveniences resulting from it, such as the increase of Potgi which was a loss to Govt and other expenses in separating them & and that if the Dy Commr did not concur with him in ~~stating~~ the opinion that the Shanbhogs should work and receive potgi according to their haki, he would solicit the sanction of Govt for the separation of the villages. This was communicated to the Amildar and he re- ported that if the villages were not separated no work could be extracted from the Shanbhogs of the smaller villages, and yet they were to be given the Potgi, that the Shanbhogs

× Serial No 21 of V.P.
No 317 of 31-12-95.

of Hangala and Kalingandana-
halli which were large
villages were not willing
to work by turns and that
if they were ordered to work
by turns Govt work would
suffer. He therefore recom-
mended the separation of
the villages in question.
6. This report of the amil-
dar was forwarded* to
the Survey Superintendent
for the needful being done.
The Survey Superintendent
asked the Dy Commr to
consider the case again
and stated that he was
not in favor of the separation
& that the Shanbhags might
be asked to work by turns
one for two years and the
other for one year. The Dy

* Serial No 21 of C.P.
Nallamangala.

× Serial No 22 of I. P.
No 1524 of 22. 2. 96.

Commr. then enquired as to what the Shanbhogs had to say in the matter and why they did not raise any objection when the villages were being amalgamated. The Amildar reported that Shanbhogs stated that they ~~did so~~ were not consulted in the matter and that they could not raise objection then. He further stated that they were not willing to work by turns, that the villages were surveyed separately during the Survey and that there was not much difficulty in separating them. The Amildar was then asked to state whether the absorption was done without the ~~recommendation~~ of the Taluk Authorities and the Amildar reported in reply that the absorption was made

× Serial No 23 of I. P.
No 445 of 7. 4. 96.

× Serial No 23/1 of I. P.
No 516 of 5. 6. 96.

without the knowledge of the Shanbhogs concerned and without the recommendation of the Taluk authorities. and that the list × forwarded from the Taluk showed that Hangala, Hosahalli was meant to Hangala ~~Kasaba~~ but to Devarahalli & that Pasain-pura was not recommended to be added to any other village. The Dy Comr then requested the Sur: Supt Dy to forward references wherein the absorption was recommended by the District and Taluk authorities. The references × then forwarded by the Survey Superintendent showed that the Amildar was consulted in the matter and the Dy Comr

× Serial No 8 of 1.2

Serial No 23 of 1.2

Serial Nos 1, 2 & 3 of the Sub file at the end of the ver: file.

No list sent by the supdt. of Rev Sur: Contains the names of three villages - the Amildar (Syed Ahmed) raised no question about them. 12

asked the Amildar to explain why he reported otherwise. In his explanation the Amildar stated that the previous report appeared to have been made by the then Amildar without reference to the old records and again recommended the separation of the villages. The Dy Comr then ordered that as the Survey Supdt was not in favor of the separation, the villages could not be separated, and that the work of Kaligaon dumaisaii & Pasaimpura should be done for two years by the Shanbhag of the former village and for one year by the Shanbhag of the latter and that the work of the villages of Hangala and Hangala-

× Serial No 27 of 1. P.
No 327 dt 19. 3. 97.
Also Serial Nos 24, 25 & 26.

× Sabhapathi Pillai.

× Serial No 27 of 1. P.
No. 327 dt 15. 4. 97.

-hosahalli should be
similarly divided. The
Amildar again reported that * Serial No 28 of D.O.
the Shanbhogs of Hangala No 108 of 17-8-97.
and Kaiyandanahalli stated
that they had only one village
each & that they would find
it difficult to secure their
livelihood when they were
unemployed and requested
that their villages might be
separated; and that the
Shanbhogs of Pasainpura
and Hangalahosahalli
agreed to work by turns
and requested that if they
were given no turns, the
villages might be separated.
He recommended the
separation of the villages.

7 The Dy Comr then asked * Serial No 28 of D.O.
the Survey Superintendent No 382 of 24-8-97.
to reconsider the case and
stated that he could not
according to rules order
the Shanbhogs to work

Serial No 28 of U.P.
No 634 of 7.9.97.

× Serial No 29 of U.P.
No 535 of 16.9.97.

key terms. The Survey Supt of
again stated that he saw no
objection in ordering the
Shanbhogs to work key terms
according to their rank and
that if this was found not
possible, he would obtain
the sanction of Govt for the
separation. The Dy Comr
replied that in Govt Proc:
No 1361/3 - 198/1061 of 24.2.91
it was laid down that
permission to work key
terms could not be granted
to Shanbhogs and requested
the Sur Supt to propose
to Govt the separation of
the villages in question.

8. The Supt of Revenue
Survey in his letter No
165 of 2.9.98 submitted
the case for the orders of
Govt and stated that
the separation seemed
a retrograde measure

and injurious to the
revenue administration.
He suggested that though
the Hak of the Chaukhag
must be supported, whether
Govt might not, although
no such rule now exists,
rule that in cases of
the kind in question, the
duties of Chaukhag might
be performed by turns
under such terms as
may be arranged by
the Dy Comr with the
parties concerned. The
vernacular papers con-
nected with the case
were then called for in
this office No. 2305 Dy
R932
17. 7. 98 and the Supdt
of Rev Survey has submitted
the same with his No.

2/93 24.7.98.

Submitted for
Secretary for
Orders re
2/11/98

This is a particularly
& the only satisfactory
settlement of it would
be the Declaration de
Monaghy has often re-
-commended by the
Local authorities. The
amalgamation was
a mistake & should
not have been pro-
-moved by the Nun
Authority.

Ruled 26/11/98
2-11-98.

Under the
penalties
of this
warrant
the Sheriff
must
enforce
this order
26/11/98

Draft ruled

(General Serial No. 30).

1892.

OFFICE OF THE
24
4th APR. 92

From The Superintendent Andaman

To The Secretary to the Government of Bengal

Dated Port Blair 1st April 1892

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.

No. 2

Subject

I beg to forward for submission and for publication in the usual manner the accompanying list of villages in the Ganduchak Tauk proposed to be created

2. The Deputy Commissioner Akyab District has, in his yadi No. 1516 dated 4th ultimo concurred

Read 7-4-92 Draft Rules

L.R. 123-91

11/4

B1 7-4-92

concerned in the proposals

in question.

H. Vincent

Superintendent

Atlantic Telegraph

Statement showing the description of villages in the Gudalpet Taluk

Village	Number	Villages to be examined	Number	Villages to be examined in the numbers in column 3	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rangaswamy	*	Nate	1 2	Nellikkipura Gundgadipura	
Sri Kanambur	1 2 3 4 5	Kiyambadi-pura Byalikuppe Hagivaikan-pura Chikdain-pura Kadabur	1 1 1 1 1	Arikangavadan-hundi Kaimadipura Anekadipura Hagalapura Gopipura	
Mangala	6 7 8 9	Kabbigere Hegvadi Kalegavadan-hatti Devarhalli	1 1 1 1	Kaikanapura Ujjhidi Pasaipura Arikatipura	

Mangalore continued	12 Mangalore 23	1	Mangalo=shoshalli
	11 Lakeri	1	Shelumaragu=fura
	12 Mangalore		Kunigenfura
	13 Nidanifura		Kilakinaru=halli
		2	Shanbhuru=Gopanathpura
	14 Bhandi=fura	1	Yadkunte
Kolaru	15 Darigeri	1	Kundu
	16 Bennibadi	1	Gyaradalli
		2	Kupsagara
	17 Darigeri	1	Darakeri=dinni
	18 Nanniśkan=halli	1	Shettihalli

Superintendent Rail Survey

R

1892 93

Notice

To,

The Compiler, Dr. G.
" Superintendent
Revenue Survey.

L. R. 123 9-2

Dated 11/14 th April 1892

No 15 & 717/2

Notice of abolition of villages in the Gundlepet Taluq, Mysore District

Notification No. 5 of 1914

The undermentioned Statement showing the alteration of villages in the Gandhabel-Tāluk, Ulundurpet District is published for general information:—

Name of Village	Number	Villages to be altered	Number	Villages to be absorbed in those mentioned in col 3	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rajavanjura	1	Kattu	1	Kattavanjura	
			2	Pungavanjura	
Chinnakonandal	1	Arungattanjura	1	Kattangarattan kuppam	
	2	Pattakkupam	2	Tāmaraikuppam	
	3	Manamalaipura	3	Sembadipura	
	4	Mandapura	4	Nagalapura	
	5	Kandaram	5	Periyapura	
Mangala	7	Kattipura	6	Kandarampura	
	8	Kayaru	7	Vellara	
	9	Kattiyanandal	8	Pasumpura	
	10	Devanadi	9	Sirumapura	

	11	Langlois		1	Langue Française
	12	Cahier		1	Littérature ancienne
	13	Langlois		1	Française
	14	Littérature		1	Étrangère
				2	Allemande
					Grammaire
	15	Allemande		1	Exercices.
	16	Anglais		1	Traduction
	17	Commercial		1	Rédaction
				2	Correspondance
	18	Comptabilité		1	Arithmétique
	19	Arithmétique		1	Algèbre

Copies de la Commission
Paris, Imprimerie ... 11 avril 1892

Pour ordre.

Mme 11/4/92
Finder Secretary

Mlle

Le Commissaire Délégué pour la Circulation
Mlle Directrice Centrale
Le Délégué Spécial.

No 111
2

Mme

Livre Journalier de l'Arrondissement, Rue Lecourbe
Visé, Reçu au No de Matière 11 Avril 1892.

Pour ordre
Mme 11/4
Finder Secretary

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 1659
SEP 3 1898
No. 253
DEWAN'S OFF

Gen. 30.]

1898

From The Asst Mysore Resr
Survey

To
The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the
Govt. of Mysore.
Gen & Rev Depts.

Dated 2nd September 1898
Despatched
Received

Enclosure No.

General No. 165
No.

In reply to

SUBJECT

Requesting orders on the subject of making separate villages of the Pasarinpur & Hangal Koshalli Gundlupet Tk

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Rev S/9/98

Notification quoted for

R23 8/9/98

The Connected papers have not been sub- The Circs: under which the Govt now treats the villages & the treated as Asli are not clear

8/9/98

Case for the Dy Comm Gen Rev Secretary

12-9-98

Dy Comm

Dy Comm

Dy Comm

L. R. 123-91-3

No 165

Survey Superintendent's Office
Bangalore 2nd September
1898.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Gen. and Rev. Depts.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit for the orders of Government the following case.

2 In Government Notification No. 15 dated 11th April 1892 the absorption of the villages of Pasan-=pur and Hangal Hoshalli into the Asli villages of Koliganda-=halli and Hangal, respectively, of the Gundlupett Taluk. This absorption it is needless to say had the

the concurrence of the Deputy Commissioner, before I recommend=ed it to Government.

3 The Deputy Commissioner in his Yadd No 382 of the 24th August 1877, recommends that the villages concerned should now be again made into separate villages. This seems a retrograde measure and injurious to the revenue administra=tion. I am of course aware that the "fiat" of the Shanbogue must be supported but I would submit whether Government might not, although no such Rule now exists, rule, that in such cases the duties of Shanbogue might be performed by

by turns under such terms as may be arranged by the Deputy Comm.r with the parties concerned.

I have the hon.r to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

Capt. Mysore Rec.r Survey

To.

The Supdt. Rev. Survey
in Mysore.

Dated. 1/K/9/98

No. 2385 -
R. 732

His letter No 165 dated
2nd September 1898, regarding
the formation into Separate Villages
of the two
villages of Devanipur and
Hangal Hosahalli in the Gauripet
were ordered to be ab-
-sorbed in the Atti villages
of Koligandanahalli and
Hangal, respectively in
Ratifn No 15 dated 11th April
1892.

Adverting to the
above, has the honor
to request that the
of Rev. Survey will

forward this office
good as to ~~submit~~ the
Dy. Comm'r's file No. 382
referred to in the above, and
other connected papers,
~~at the early date~~.

By order

Asstt
for Secretary

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT
2243
SEP 6 1898
R 1283
OFFICE

General Serial No. 30.

1898.

From The Supt. Mysore Pal
Survey

To The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Gen'l, Pol & Sec Depts

Dated

Despatched 24th September,
1898.

Received

Enclosures No. Vernacular
correspondence

General No. 219
No.

Rcd 6/10/98.
Subd.
18/10/18.

Secretary's Docket No.
2335 / R 932 of 7th Instant.

Has the favor to forward,
as desired, the Vernacular
correspondence ending with
No. 382 and the same
may be returned when no
longer required.

Supt.
Supt. Mysore Pal
Survey.

26/9/98

Read:-

Correspondence ending with docket No. 219 of 24th September 1895, from the Superintendent of Rev: Survey in Mysore, regarding the separation of the Dukhla villages of Pasaipura and Hangalahosahalli from the respective Asli villages of Kaligaudanahalli and Hangala, in the Gundlupet Taluk.

— o —

Order thereon:-

In Govt. Notn. No. 15 of 11th April 1892, the absorption ~~of the~~ (as Dukhla) villages of Pasaipura & Hangalahosahalli ~~mentioned in the above~~ was ordered in accordance with the recommendation made by the Supdt. of Rev: Survey which was based on the proposal made by the ex-inidar. But the

L.R. 123-21-6

2 Dy. S.

3956
R. 1946
3957 dy 5.12.96

3.

H.V.P.

Shanthiago of the 4 villages in question being 4 different persons, the abscription affected their interests and the Shanthiago of the Dakhla villages of ~~Paraiyapa and Kangala~~ ~~hasanthi~~ requested that their villages might be kept separate. The Dy Commr recommended to the Survey Supdt that the villages might be separated. But the ~~Survey Supdt~~ latter was not in favor of the separation at first and asked the Dy Commr to arrange for the carrying out of the work by making the Chanthiago work by turns. ~~The~~ an arrangements of this kind having been found unpopular, the Dy Commr has ~~separately~~ and strongly recommended the separation, ~~to effect~~ the ~~Sur. Supdt recommended~~ ~~ction~~ ~~ction~~

2. Govt observe that the amalgamation of the villages in question was a mistake and should not have been proposed by the then Amildar. Under the peculiar circumstances of the case, the separation of the Dakhla villages, so strongly and so often re-commended by the local authorities is sanctioned. They will hence forward be 3. A Notification to the above effect will be published in the Mysore Gazette.

Recognized & treated as Inam villages by themselves

1-12-98

30/11/98 Secretary.

To

The Superintendent of Rev: Survey in Mysore returning over: papers.

3957
~~3956~~ dt 2.12.98.
R 1947 3.

L R 123--91-7

Notification.

Government are pleased to direct the two Dakhla villages of Pasaipura and Hangalahosahalli now attached to the Asli villages of Kaligaudanahalli and Hangala, respectively, in the Gundlupet Taluk, be separated and henceforward treated as Asli villages by themselves.

"By order"

2/12/98

1/12/98 Secretary.

To

The Compiler, Mysore Gazette
for publication.

P. Fl. 120 of 93.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1891-92.
~~192~~ .
(L. R)

File No. 123 of 91
Serial Nos. 1 to 7

Later references.
L. R. 153 of 92
L. R. 142 of 95
L. R. 141 of 96.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1 to 7

M. ~~Part~~ B for December 1898.

SUBJECT.

Separation of Villages of Pasampur and Hangala-hosalli from the respective villages of Kaligandanhalli and Hangal in the Gundlapet taluk.

Cld
RJ